The Reconstructionist

ol. XIII. November 14, 1947 Kislev 1, 5708 No. 14

- *WHY RABBIS FEEL FRUSTRATED*
  by Herbert Parzen
- *THE ACTION PROGRAM OF ROSENZWEIG AND THAT OF RECONSTRUCTIONISM*
  by Leo Trepp
- *TWO LYRICS*
  by Rosalind Darrow
- *EXILE OR DIASPORA, WHICH?* *(Review)*
  by Mordecai M. Kaplan

cated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of el's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $2.00 per year; 10c per copy; foreign 25c extra; membership in the Foundationn, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD:
Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Will Herberg, Aharon Kessler, Edward T. Sandrow, Judah Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Jack J. Cohen, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Samuel Dinin, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Louis M. Levitsky Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, Sidney Morgenbesser, Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ROSALIND DARROW is an American student at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

HERBERT PARZEN is a rabbi, educator, and writer.

LEO TREPP is rabbi of Temple Sinai, Tacoma, Washington, and a contributing editor to THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

All books reviewed in *The Reconstructionist* and other books of interest may be obtained from the Reconstructionist Book Department, 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Reprinted by Popular Demand

THE MEANING OF GOD IN MODERN JEWISH RELIGION

By MORDECAI M. KAPLAN

This significant work interpreting the Sabbath, the Holydays and the Festivals in terms of modern thought and experience has been reprinted by popular request.

381 pages with index $3.00 per copy

A study syllabus entitled

JEWISH RELIGIOUS BELIEF FOR TODAY

is available for use with this book.

Fifty cents per copy.

JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.,
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of THE MEANING OF GOD IN MODERN JEWISH RELIGION.

Please send me ..... copies of the syllabus JEWISH RELIGIOUS BELIEF FOR TODAY.

Check for $..... is enclosed.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

The Reconstructionist

Vol. XIII. November 14, 1947 Kislev 1, 5708 No. 14

EDITORIALS

ENEMIES FROM WITHIN

WHILE the eyes of the Jewish world were hopefully focused on the proceedings of the *ad hoc* Palestine Committee of the UN, a situation developed in the Yishuv that threatened to cancel out whatever victory looms ahead at Lake Success. The smouldering fire of civil war between the Haganah and the Irgun flared up menacingly. Had it been permitted to continue, the chain reaction of attack and counter-attack might have led us far on the road to disaster.

Fortunately, some sort of truce seems to have been effected between the Haganah and the Irgun. According to a dispatch to the *New York Times,* dated November 4th, the Irgun in response to questions by the *Times* correspondent declared in part that, "in the event of Arab aggression, cooperation with Haganah is conceivable on the basis of an appropriate allocation of functions, if only Ben Gurion's vainglory does not nullify it from the outset."

As for the Irgun's opposition to partition, which has been accepted in principle by the Jewish Agency, the Irgun spokesman declared: ". . . if . . . it becomes a reality, which we do not believe, we shall never recognize the legality of carving up our country and we shall find appropriate means of fighting for the restoration of its integrity. We shall oppose any Jewish government which accepts carving up of the homeland. . . . But we shall not use arms against any Jewish government." He also stated, with regard to the proposed international police force, "it would not receive these soldiers of neutral or possibly friendly states with fire."

Accordingly there has been a suspension of violent action as between Haganah and Irgun and the imminent threat of civil war has been averted.

But, as long as the Irgun exists as a private army not responsible to the elected representatives of the Jewish people or the Yishuv, the potential danger remains. It may perhaps be argued that the Irgun and its supporters are entitled to carry on political propaganda in opposition to partition or any other policy of the Jewish Agency or the future Jewish state. But the right to conduct propaganda against a government cannot be conceded to groups that have renounced their allegiance to that government as the Irgun and the other dissident group, the Sternists, have done.

There is, however, a more basic issue at stake; one that goes to the very heart of the existence and security of the Jewish State. No government can accept the existence of private armies. The bitter experience of a quarter of a century of world politics has demonstrated that such private armies in the guise of political

parties constitute the supreme threat to any government. Such experience demonstrates further that private armies become the means whereby minority groups in moments of confusion seize control of the state and then proceed to suppress all opposition by force. That pattern must not be permitted to repeat itself in the Yishuv. Every state can have but one security force. In Eretz Yisrael that force is the Haganah. All other armed groups must now be called upon in no uncertain terms to disband, and to join the Haganah. The Yishuv will need, in the days ahead, every source of strength it can muster. Disciplined and responsible to the legally constituted authorities of the Jewish State, such accretion of strength will steel the Yishuv for whatever trials the future holds. Uncontrolled, such groups can only fatally weaken the Yishuv before the real test comes.

This is, at the moment, the fundamental issue involved. All else is subsidiary. Reprehensible as are the present tactics of the Irgun and the Stern group—such as extortion and murders for revenge—it is their very existence that must be challenged. Everyone either within or outside of the Yishuv, who strengthens the hands of the dissidents, is guilty of treason, for now he is giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the Jewish State. Let the Zionist Organization make this crystal clear and let the authorities of the Yishuv act with determination in the knowledge that they have the full support of Jews everywhere.

THE PROBLEM OF JEWISH CENTER LEADERSHIP

THE Jewish Center Division Committee has adopted a set of principles for the Jewish Centers associated with the National Jewish Welfare Board. These principles emerge from the long and thorough study made by Dr Janowsky and his committee of the status of the entire Center movement. We have previously commended the Janowsky report for its positive Jewish approach. The five "principles" recently published bear out the belief that the Center movement intends to go beyond generalizations; it expects to translate those generalizations into *program*. Article 2 reads: "The Program of the Jewish Center should devote primary attention to Jewish content . . . the first and greatest emphasis should be placed upon the spiritual-cultural factors which constitute the Jewish way of life."

The question now arises: how will such a program be carried out? Without a specific plan for its implementation, the program remains a mere pious wish. The fact that Article 5 of the "principles" provides that "compliance with the articles here set forth shall be a condition of new and, after not more than three years, of continuing affiliation with the JWB" seems to indicate that the Center Division Committee is sincere in its desire for action. But sincerity, worthy as it is, remains helpless without means, without the tools with which to work. The tools in this case are the *personnel*.

The people who would have the knowledge, the skills and the will to carry through the new program are almost totally lacking. Center workers themselves would not dispute this statement. They know the history of the Center movement. They know how the workers now in the field have been drawn in, most of them the products of the movement itself during the years when the program was not positive, not Jewish in the sense which it is now proposed the program should become. Indeed, the products of the Center movement are the evidence which the Janowsky committee had at its disposal when it recommended the basic change in the Center approach.

Who then shall lead the Center movement into the new path? This is indeed a difficult problem; and the first step toward solving it is to recognize the difficulty. We are gratified to learn that Mr. Louis Kraft, who served the JWB for so many years as Director, and who has now retired from that post, will not withdraw altogether from the field he has served so well. He will devote himself specifically to the task of putting the new principles into practice. Undoubtedly, he will soon realize, if he has not realized it already, that *training workers* is the first and major task to be undertaken. Since the demise of the old Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, no serious effort has been made to turn out people who could handle the educational aspects of a Jewish Center. The experiment now being carried on in the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service is extremely limited in its scope and applicability. The course is offered only to men and women who are already in the field, and hence it is so pressed for time that the students are compelled to absorb several years' studying in a few months. This kind of shock treatment may be wholesome for arousing interest; but it cannot serve as a foundation for life-long service.

Clearly, the Center movement will have to cooperate with other educational agencies in order to attract the right kind of personnel, and to train them. This calls for a close partnership with rabbis and educators, with seminaries and teachers training schools. If such partnership is to be set up, however, some basic changes will have to take place in the attitudes of all concerned toward one another. The Center must no longer assume the negative attitude toward religion — and by negative we mean *neutral* too. It is one thing not to take sides in a difference of opinion between the Orthodox, Reform and Conservative; it is quite another to be neutral in the conflict between the religious and the non-religious.

The synagogues and the rabbis, on the other hand, must not regard the Centers as competitors who must be outbid. They must not identify the "secular" with the anti-religious. They must not merely deplore the un-Jewishness of the Centers; they must help transform them into truly *Jewish* Centers. Synagogues, which are fortunate enough to be able to function as Synagogue-Centers, should seek to set the pattern and the standards, and not fall to the level of the institutions which their own rabbis so roundly denounce.

The Jewish Center movement is on the threshold of a new era. It is the responsibility of all Jewish institutions to help usher it in.

UNCIVILIZED INFRINGEMENTS OF CIVIL RIGHTS

IN the foul moral atmosphere of this post-war era, with its cynical revolt against social control of the scramble for riches, with its revival of racial antagonisms and religious bigotries, with its inquisitorial proceedings against political heresies, and with its irresponsible war-mongering appeals to national chauvinism, the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights comes like a breath of fresh air. The conscience of America speaks from its pages. The Committee made a thorough study of all the many ways in which the rights of the individual in America are so often denied him. Its report covers infringements of civil rights by the action or connivance of government agencies, and by groups exercising economic or political power. The report also makes recommendations for safeguarding those rights.

The following are some of the sores in our American life which the report probes: lynchings, disfranchisement of Negroes,

racial segregation, economic discrimination on racial and religious grounds, denial of education and health services on like grounds, group libel, abuses of the mails by propagandists of hate, etc. To cure these sores the Committee recommends: (1) the expansion of the Department of Justice to enable it to deal effectively with civil rights cases; (2) a Federal anti-lynching law, giving the Federal Bureau of Investigation jurisdiction over all lynching cases; (3) Federal anti-poll-tax legislation; (4) a Federal law establishing a permanent FEPC and prohibiting all forms of discrimination in employment on work for the Federal government and the financing by the Federal government of public or private agencies (including those of the States) that practice discrimination; (5) Federal registration of all groups engaged in public propaganda, with provision for public disclosure of their tax returns, and with postal regulations prohibiting mail that does not bear the name and address of the sender; (6) full trial rights for Federal employees charged with disloyalty; (7) granting of suffrage to citizens of the District of Columbia and to the Indians of New Mexico and Arizona, of citizenship to the people of Guam and of American Samoa, and of naturalization rights to all aliens without discrimination on grounds of race, color or national origin.

The Committee has done its work and done it well. Whether its work will be effective is now up to the nation. The national conscience of America can know no peace, now that the extent of its sins against democracy are clearly revealed, until it has atoned for them by measures like those recommended in the Report.

The situation in the world today makes our country the chief protagonist of democracy among the nations. Yet so flagrant has been our oppression of at least one element of our population, the Negro, that its spokesmen felt obliged to call upon the United Nations for redress. As at present constituted, the United Nations is not likely to take any effective action on the appeal of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People. We hope that some day it may have authority to take remedial action where any minority is oppressed. But even if the only effect of the Association's petition to UN is to humiliate us before the bar of world public opinion, that humiliation is amply deserved, and should lead to national repentance.

It is good to note that one important personage in a key position with reference to the problem, Attorney General Tom Clark, publicly declared himself "humiliated" by the fact that any group of Americans found it necessary to appeal to UN to redress their grievances. "I feel very deeply," he added, "the obligation which rests upon me and upon the great department of government which I head to do everything which is possible to secure to every citizen the rights of citizenship which are unquestionably his. To this end the civil rights unit of the Department of Justice is being enlarged and strengthened."

But the Department of Justice is not the entire Government. The situation cannot be radically improved without legislation. It will not be easy to pass that legislation. The sinister forces responsible for the abuses which the Committee on Civil Rights castigates will do their utmost to defeat the necessary legislation. A tremendous public pressure will have to be brought to bear on Congress to abolish those abuses.

We hope that our readers will keep a sharp watch on legislative proposals bearing on civil rights. Let them study such proposals carefully, and subject them to searching discussion. Then let them act zealously to secure the passage of all

measures designed to protect every American, of whatever race, religion or national origin, against any form of discrimination and oppression.

REALITIES AND VALUES

THE VINDICTIVE SPITE OF BRITish officialdom seems still to pursue the former passengers of the Exodus 1947.

This observation is based on the account in a JTA dispatch from Lubeck, Germany, of the way Exodus refugees were transferred from the Poppendorf Camp to their new quarters at Emden:

"The first shipment of approximately 800 people . . . filed into completely bare and rickety wooden railway cars. . . . Men, women and children will be forced to lie on dirty floors in unheated cars until tomorrow morning when the slow-moving trains are expected to arrive at Emden. . . . The only concession made by the British was to supply one ambulance car with a dozen beds, which was not nearly enough for the number of cases of advanced pregnancy and invalids. Those who cannot be accommodated in the beds will have to sit on wooden benches in the vehicle. Only soup was prepared by the British for the journey."

Fellow DP's in the British zone have offered their share of the monthly quota of immigration certificates, 375 in all, to enable the Exodus passengers to enter Eretz Yisrael legally. Similarly Jewish DP's interned in Cyprus have offered one month's quota of their share of certificates, amounting to 750.

But the Pharaoh of the new Exodus, like that of the old, seems to have hardened his heart against the divine command, "Let my people go!"

▼

THERE IS HARDLY A BETTER INdex of a community's morale than its birth-rate. The will to live asserts itself among human beings most significantly in the will to perpetuate the race. When a people loses faith in its future, it tends to resort to race-suicide. Conversely, when people who have passed through the most harrowing of experiences seek not only to keep alive but to give birth to new life, it is a token of faith that life "could be fair."

How significant then are the following facts which we cull from an item in *The National Jewish Post* of October 24:

"Jewish births in the DP camps of the U. S. Zone in Germany have soared to 660 a month—one of the highest birth-rates in the world—a survey completed by the Joint Distribution Committee . . . showed this week. This rate is more than double the American rate of 23 per 1000. . . . Almost one-third of all Jewish women between the ages of 18 and 45 . . . are either expectant or nursing mothers."

We are reminded of the story of the Egyptian bondage, "The more they oppressed them, the more they multiplied."

We pray that the faith and courage of these brave mothers may be rewarded, that they may have the *zekhut* of raising their children to manhood and womanhood in the Jewish commonwealth of Eretz Yisrael.

▼

Labor in Palestine, THE WEEKly press release of the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine (Histadrut), in its issue of October 24, has some interesting figures showing the numerical growth of the movement, year by year, from 1925 to 1947.

Skipping the intermediate years, we find that, in 1925, the number of Histadrut members was 9,000 or 53 percent of the then total of 17,000 Jewish workers. In 1947, the number stands at 131,000 or 75 percent of the present total of 175,-

000 workers. Together with the wives of the workers, the total reaches 174,000.

Largely in consequence of its marvelous organization, labor in Eretz Yisrael has achieved a social status that gives meaning to the phrase, "the dignity of labor." The Jewish worker there is no robot. He feels himself, through his organization, a partner in the work of creating the Jewish national home.

The same bulletin gives some interesting facts about *Hanoar Haoved* (Working Youth), its juvenile branch. *Hanoar Haoved* established 26 collective settlements, in which youngsters born in Eretz Yisrael, who constitute the majority, mixed with Jewish youth from other countries in setting up their pioneering communities.

▼

A "Conference on Equality of Opportunity in Higher Education" to take place early in 1948 is being called by a number of leading educators headed by Dr. A. C. Ivy, vice-president of the University of Illinois and Dr. Anton J. Carlson, famous physiologist of the University of Chicago. The initiative in suggesting the conference was taken by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

This is welcome news. Unless our higher education is truly democratic, it will exercise a corrupting influence on our whole national life. It will provide the veneer of respectability for the sinister prejudices, bigotries and race hatreds that are responsible for lynchings, pogroms and persecutions.

If our professors are not careful they may find that their catering to fashionable snobbishness will have encouraged the rise of an American Hitler who has no better use for professors than had the German Hitler. They will be employed only for devising rationalizations to justify and methods to effect the wholesale slaughter of whatever minority may rouse his insane ire.

▼

Atheists are wont to criticise the churches for their assumption of infallibility and their dogmatic suppression of freedom of thought.

They forget that atheism too is a matter of faith and that, where it is entrenched in a position of authority it can be as dogmatic, intolerant and hostile to true free-thinking as any other orthodoxy.

We are informed in a release of *Religious News Service* for October 20 that *Komsomolskaya Pravda,* the chief organ of the Communist Youth League, published a statement by the League's central committee condemning the *Young Bolshevik* magazine for printing articles favorable to "religious tolerance." The committee declared that it is "impossible and unpermissible for young Communists to believe in God or to perform religious rites."

The atheist church of Russia should have learned from the experience of other churches that it does not pay to suppress freedom of tought.

▼

A London minister, the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead, reports a new type of religious service, intended to rid congregations of the frustration of never being able to "talk back." His service is divided into three parts: one for devotion, one for preaching and one for questions and answers. Worshipers were told that they need not attend any part of the service that did not appeal to them, but almost all remained for the entire service.

We believe that the innovation is not altogether strange to the synagogue. Some congregations have had discussion periods after their Friday night service, at least occasionally. At any rate, the practice is worth experimenting with.

Why Rabbis Feel Frustrated

By HERBERT PARZEN

THE Jewish community is apparently in a ferment of self-searching. Programs and plans are promulgated for an expected renascence within American Jewish life. Various groups and organizations have published their panaceas for the prevailing ills, seeking, at the same time, new methods and techniques to safeguard and to enrich the Jewish historical tradition within the Jewish community.

This is as it should be. Every group has the right, in democratic society, to formulate its views and to advocate their acceptance by the general community. This is fundamental to the realization of a genuine revival in cultural and religious living.

However, no group has included, as far as I have observed, in its published programs, a plea to strengthen the status of the men in the rabbinate. Perhaps this is due to the belief that as the community sheds many of its gross habits the position of the rabbinate will find its proper pattern, clothed in dignity and well-being. Perhaps! I wonder.

The Need for Public Discussion of the Problem

It is nonetheless perplexing to find no reference to this problem, for a problem it is, in the public discussions of the day, particularly as applied to future planning. Silence seems tacitly decreed as a matter of good manners, tact, or perhaps, indifference.

In the meantime the rabbinate is sorely stricken and frustrated. Obviously these attitudes of mind and heart are not brought into the open; they are nonetheless a chief topic of "shop" conversation among rabbis. And I venture the opinion that no constructive change in the life of American Israel is feasible without freeing the rabbinate from these awful burdens. Furthermore, I earnestly believe that public debate of the issues involved is prerequisite to any solution of this grave but unspoken problem or even its mitigation.

It is interesting to note that, as far back as 1875, the need of dealing with this problem was recognized. At the dedication of the Hebrew Union College, the first rabbinical college in America, the following words were uttered by Dr. Max Lillienthal:

"In order to encourage young and talented men to study as rabbis, and to offer them the prospect of a secured livelihood, two measures have to be adopted. First, the annual elections of preachers have to be abolished, and abolished in good earnest. What good man, having devoted his youth and his talents to this profession, will expose himself and his future to the whims of public opinion and individual favor? I, at least, for my part, would not risk the future of my children to such a precarious position, and I am sure every thoughtful father will coincide with me in this regard. The elections must be during good behavior; this point gives full guarantee to the congregations that no unworthy man shall hold their office and draw the salary; and to the minister it gives that independence which is indispensably required for the conscientious administration of the holy and responsible office.

"And the other measure I advocate is, stop starting new congregations where a

congregation is already established, unless the increasing number of worshipers requires it. Our congregations, with a few exceptions, are yet young, and most of them unable to pay a salary adequate to the demands and cost of living. This evil can only be remedied if the number of contributing members will increase, so that not in every nook and corner of every little town a new congregation will spring into existence."

The Conservative Rabbinate

Though vexations inhere in every section of the Jewish ministry, what I have to say here has particular reference to the Conservative rabbinate because I know it rather intimately. Moreover, what I have to say does not apply to the entire Conservative constituency. Perhaps approximately twenty percent of its congregations may be excepted. But this analysis, unfortunately, does apply to the remainder.

What, then is the problem? Generally speaking, it is threefold in form: social, professional and psychological.

The income of the rabbi may often be adequate but his security is not. His tenure is indefinite. As a rule he must submit to reelection every year; even men who have served their congregations for a decade or longer must undergo this dignity-destroying ceremonial.

What is even more embarrassing, congregations seem possessed with a panting passion for youth. The social and psychological reasons therefor are sufficiently well known to require no detailed elucidation. This demand for young men, recently ordained, is a fact. "Life may begin at forty," but not in the rabbinate. A rabbi in the forties who needs placement, whatever the reason, is in a hapless, mortifying position.

The consequence of this attitude is that experience and wisdom, insight and knowledge of people and community have little, if any, value or status in the appraisal of the equipment of a man for the pulpit. Men, in the forties are regarded as undesirable, as, indeed, debilitated, in the sense that they are deemed physically unable to attract people, especially young people. Even chaplains of middle age, returning from war service, have found their maturity an embarrasing handicap to proper placement.

The social status of the rabbinate is beautifully and succinctly summarized by a remark attributed to a prominent and responsible official, in the Conservative movement, who knows the scene at first hand. This is his sentence: "Eighty percent of our men sit on a volcano."

Moreover, the rabbi is without professional status. He is not regarded as an expert in his field. His opinion carries little weight. Hence he has no authority, and no prestige to function effectively.

I hasten at once to make clear that I do not suggest that the rabbi be an authoritarian ecclesiastic who functions arbitraily by fiat or even by the authority vested in the office by tradition. I do mean that he be given the kind of authority which flows from the training and the education required of a person for his work. In this connection contrast the position of the rabbinate with that of social service executives, center administrators, or educators. (I am not referring to teachers in our schools. With their woeful lot I am not concerned here.) They are conceded professional rank. They are expected to be experts, especially trained for their tasks. They are directing executives of their agencies, with all the prestige that their training and accumulated experience bestow. To the extent that the contrary holds true in the rabbinate—and it holds true to a very great extent—the rabbinate lacks dignity, prestige and effectiveness. Need I describe the routine goings-on

n the life of congregations *vis à vis* their eligious leaders? — the petty politics, the nalicious hurts, the senseless insults!

Danger from a Frustrated Rabbinate

The psychological effect of this state of affairs on the rabbi is gruesome, literally gruesome. Self-respect is worn thin. A sense of shame and even of sin, gnaws at his ego. Frustration corrodes his being. This is, of course, a cumulative and progressive process.

At first the rabbi fights back valiantly. He gathers strength and resourcefulness to combat the prevailing *hafkerut* from his innermost convictions and his dedication to Judaism. Gradually his steadfastness and his convictions become undermined. He seeks to make peace with his environment. He concludes from his own experience with congregations and from knowledge of that of his colleagues that the struggle is hopeless. To resist is to be stigmatized as tactless, a fearful sin. After all, he must have a post in order to live. So he yields and yields and yields. . . .

In one of the issues of *The Reconstructionist,* there were printed excerpts from a personal letter, received from a rabbi which fully corroborates this analysis. A few lines are, therefore, quite *à propos*: "So you see, here I am in my fifty-second year of life, in my twenty-seventh year in the rabbinate, a discontented unhappy fellow who seeths with inner rebellion, feels like a 'heel,' although a religious one, and would sweep away with one annihilating gesture the whole mess on our hands. . . . I too would like to have peace of mind, but no book gives it to me. I am moving into old age with a feeling of wasteland in my heart. . . ." I believe that this state of mind is typical of a large segment of the rabbinate.

Is it not time for people in religious associations to know the grief and the vexations of the men whose duty it is to teach them religious living? Should they not make some effort to understand the minds and the hearts of their rabbis? I submit that frustrated personalities cannot imbue their disciples with triumphant religious principles or even with loyalty to Jewish interests. I further submit that it behooves those who are concerned with the survival of Judaism in this country to bestir themselves and arouse the community to think about this problem. No real renaissance in Jewish religion is realizable when the men in the vanguard of the effort lack peace of mind, and suffer from a conviction of personal sinfulness because they cannot and do not teach or inspire religious living. They feel sinful because they are sinking to the irreligious level of the mass, helplessly, impotently, though with resentment. They have become worn and weary in the struggle to achieve even minimal objectives. It is only rationalization, and a false rationalization at that, that keeps them at their posts, plodding along to preserve appearances. Such men because of their state of mind and heart are not proper instruments for effecting the rebirth of Judaism.

It is not the purpose of this paper to propose plans or panaceas for the solution of this situation. It requires study. Above all, I end as I began, it is necessary that the facts be placed on the table in the open forum. Discussion may help to develop the proper plans and procedure for the happiness and self fulfillment of the rabbi. By the same token, I am convinced that continued silence aggravates and intensifies the prevailing chaos. Silence succeeds only in paralyzing men who are able, zealous and eager to build a beautiful and rewarding religious life for and with the Jews of America.

The Action Program of Rosenzweig and That of Reconstructionism

By LEO TREPP

This article is the last of a series of three, which discusses the life and work of Franz Rosenzweig, the German Jewish religious thinker and leader of the period between the two world wars, and compares his philosophy with that of Reconstructionism. The two preceding articles dealt with his spiritual biography and his philosophical principles respectively. —EDITORS

THE world in which our children grow up is not a Jewish world. For Rosenzweig it was a German world; for us it is an American world. It is not really a Christian world either. The course of history for the American Jew is directed by the following historical guideposts: Jerusalem — Athens —Rome — Dante —da Vinci — Rousseau — Goethe — Jefferson. In short, Jerusalem is the starting point of his history. The faith in one God, as proclaimed by Judaism is its foundation. Mankind is its goal. For the non-Jew, even the liberal one, the outlook is different. History leads from Athens to Rome, thence to Jerusalem, or rather Calvary, from there to Dante, and so on. History for the Christian, though based on the philosophies of the past, leads from Jesus to a pure form of Christianity to be adopted by all. This difference is seldom mentioned, but it is very real. It means that the Jewish child is actually homeless. The Jewish child is nowhere. For the Jewish child can find no place in which a truly Jewish atmosphere prevails, except perhaps in the synagogue. The public school, even the non-denominational one, does not merely make a citizen of the child; it tends to Christianize him. Like all our public institutions it is deeply imbued with the spirit of Christianity, having sprung from that spirit. Thus, for the Christian, the step out of Christianity is practically impossible, since he is surrounded by a Christian civilization. For the Jew every step away from Judaism actually is a step in the direction of Christianity.

The Aim of Education

The aim of Jewish education must thus be a twofold one. The home has failed as an agency for transmitting Jewish values; the synagogue is the only such agency left. Therefore, education must re-establish the relationship between the child and his only Jewish home — the synagogue. The wider aim of Jewish education, however, is to introduce the child into the world of Judaism, which is a complete world not dependent on outside influence.

The school, therefore, is and must be interested in the transmission of Jewish values, and in nothing else. It must enable the child to understand the development of the Jewish spirit. With this equipment, the child, when he grows up, will have to find a *modus vivendi* in the world. That is the task of the individual. It is not the function of the school either to point out the intersections between Judaism and the non-Jewish world or to tell the pupil how to arrange his relationship to the world. The motive for teaching the Torah must not be that it helps the child to overcome difficulties or that its possession compensates for disadvantages. The Torah is to be taught as something laid in our hands, a holy heritage and a holy task. To keep the Torah and Judaism alive is the responsibility of every Jew. For this responsibility the child has to be trained.

On the basis of the foregoing ideas,

Rosenzweig outlines his educational program. Classroom instruction should give the child a complete survey of Jewish literature, from the Bible down to our modern Jewish philosophers, using selected texts. Rosenzweig believed it could be done in about 750 hours of religious instruction. Judaism, being a self-contained culture, can only be fully understood in its own language. Language may be considered the most immediate expression of a people's soul. Hebrew must, therefore, hold the central place in Jewish education. The synagogue today is the only place where the child sees Judaism in action. Synagogue attendance, therefore, is imperative.

Rosenzweig's ideas are, of course, based on his system of philosophy. They, therefore, run counter to Reconstructionist ideas, even though their ultimate results in education would be similar. Rosenzweig assumed the breakdown of Judaism outside the synagogue at least during his generation; he did not provide for the establishment of other agencies in the community which would make the child aware that he lived in a Jewish civilization. Reconstructionism, on the other hand, assumes the present decay of the synagogue and is unwilling to press for its supremacy. Both views are "realistic," though they focus attention on different realities. Rosenzweig would bring up the child only in Judaism and let him make his decisions later as to his course in life. Reconstructionism, being more realistic, calls for education which allows the student to understand the problems of his world immediately. Both Reconstructionism and the philosophy of Rosenzweig are agreed that life, and not research for its own sake, is the ultimate aim, and that education does not constitute complete fulfillment of our Jewish obligations. Both agree on the central place of Hebrew, but with this difference: for Rosenzweig, *understanding* of the language is enough, for Hebrew is the medium transmitting the spirit; Reconstructionism, seeing in Hebrew the medium of expression used by the most future-minded group in Israel, namely the Jewry of Eretz Yisrael, calls both for study and *use* of Hebrew.

The most important difference, however, between the educational theories of Rosenzweig and of Reconstructionism is one of essential outlook. Rosenzweig considers our abnormal state to be our normalcy. Personal happiness plays a secondary role to him as an aim in Jewish education; Reconstructionism looks for normalcy and would, therefore, stress the compensations coming to the child and the adult from the possession of Torah. Here again Reconstructionism is more realistic.

Leadership Training

We lack leaders. This is not the fault of the institutions of higher Jewish learning who are well equipped to train teachers; it is the fault of the people. This applies to America as it applied to Germany. Rosenzweig recognized that we could attract able young men only if we guaranteed them full spiritual and material compensation for their abilities and their knowledge. We must endeavor, therefore, to produce not merely teachers but scholars, who would command respect in Jewish as well as non-Jewish circles. These men would be of real assistance to the rabbis, being of equal rank with them and would cooperate with the rabbis in different and yet related fields, as adult educators and goodwill ambassadors. Thus the rabbi's burden would be eased and he could give more time to study.

Rosenzweig knew that the average congregation could not assume the full burden of a salary for a highly trained teacher in addition to the rabbi's salary. He found a very interesting solution. He pro-

posed the creation of an Academy for the Science of Judaism which would have to have a budget. This Academy would pay about one-half of the teacher's salary. The other half would come from the congregations in which the teacher worked. In return, these scholarly teachers would have to devote their mornings to Jewish research under the auspices of the Academy. In the afternoon and evening they would conduct classes for the youth and adults of the congregation. The teachers thus would be neither scholars in ivory towers nor mere *melammedim*. Life and study would once again be one. The barrenness of Jewish life, especially in the smaller communities could thus be overcome. The community as a whole would benefit by the presence of an additional scholar in its midst. A research staff would have been created. Again Rosenzweig's basic idea breaks through: from life through study to life.

According to Rosenzweig's estimate, the Academy would need about $375,000 in order to support one hundred and fifty teachers all over the country. The Academy would allow each of them a salary of $2,500,—and the congregation would add another $2,500. Thus the young men would start out on a decent salary of $5,000, the burden on the communities would not be heavy, and Jewry as a whole would obtain a staff of one hundred and fifty research fellows for a very small outlay. In addition, young men of ability would be attached to this kind of work, both from the ideal and the practical viewpoint, and Jewry would secure adequate leaders.

This project has an additional advantage for American Jewry, apart from the educational one. Reconstructionism has always stressed the need for adequate leadership training and adequate research facilities and personnel. In addition, however, there is the need for Jewishly trained workers in fields not directly connected with religion, such as social service, and other areas of Jewish life. Rosenzweig anticipated this need, although imperfectly.

At the same time he seems to have pointed out a way which might lead us towards the establishment of a *Jewish community*. Reconstructionism has repeatedly emphasized the basic need for a Jewish community which should be more than a mere fund-raising agency. Today we are united in our drives only. Starting from this point, Rosenzweig's plan would make fund-raising the means for the creation of a unifying community organization of cultural content. The Academy would do that on a national basis; the research fellow would carry it to the local communities. He would automatically become a community "asset." This is particularly important as far as smaller Jewish communities are concerned which frequently are badly split and can afford such division even less than larger communities. Leadership training might become training for the community. The instruction of the leader would bring the community closer to being a reality and prepare the people for their community responsibility. Rosenzweig may not have thought of that development but there is a possibility that he had it in mind.

Adult Education

In adult education Rosenzweig had his greatest immediate success. His *Lehrhaus* was copied by all German congregations. Through it he was able to give youth a new interest in Judaism and stimulate many of the older generation to new thinking about Judaism. The adult academy became one of the great bulwarks against assimilation.

Rosenzweig recognized that all of us stand on the periphery of Jewish life; we must move to the core. The center is one

point, but it presents different aspects to those who stand on the periphery of the circle, depending on where they stand. For practical purposes, three fundamental aspects of the one Judaism have to be considered: classical Judaism, historical Judaism and modern Judaism with its problems. To our fathers these three formed a single unit compounded of life, tradition, hope. We have to regain this oneness. The school for adults thus may touch on all problems of life, on medicine as well as modern literature, music and art. But it must keep in mind that the topics, taken separately, are of little value. All the subjects must fit into the great master plan; they must, in some manner, carry the student from the periphery to the center of Jewish living. It is the task of the head of the institute so to map out his total program that in the course of time, the great plan will become evident and every topic be recognized as a brick in a complete edifice.

Since all subjects must fall under one of the three main divisions which Rosenzweig established—tradition, history and modern Judaism—the school was to have three departments. The first included all courses to be given on Torah, the Prophets, *halakah, haggadah.* The second department was that of history and the Jewish world. The third department deals with the Jew and his personal problems. Within these departments it was to be made clear to the students that life was the issue, not mere research. The Torah and the Prophets demonstrate the unity of principle and history; every leaf of the *Gemara,* every page of Jewish history shows how inseparable are man, thought, and life. Thus the Jew of today would learn that Judaism is a civilization; he would surround himself with a Jewish atmosphere in which he would henceforth live.

In selecting teachers, the academy saw an advantage in calling on *"Ame Haaretz"* to lead the courses. The teachers would have to stand on a higher level, but not on too high a one at the beginning. Only thus could they actually become at one with their students in their search for knowledge and wisdom. The school would grow into a fellowship. The recently established "Great Books" course, which is sponsored by the University of Chicago, follows the same principle: study of great books from texts (as suggested by Rosenzweig for his school), discussion of modern problems on the basis of the eternal truth conveyed in great books, and leadership by the layman, who remains in the group while guiding it.

Rosenzweig stressed the need for unification of all educational efforts in the community. Right now precious energy is lost because speakers have to repeat their messages speaking to small groups which should be united. More important, however, is the fact that the one Jewish academy would demonstrate the oneness of Judaism, would help defeat the spirit of caste, would serve to demonstrate that Judaism is one in all its groups. Thus Israel would unitedly undertake the work of auto-emancipation.

The educational program of Reconstructionism follows very similar lines: research into the Jewish past (classical Judaism), revaluation of tradition (historical Judaism), understanding of the problems faced by the Jew in the modern world (modern Judaism), all designed to help the Jew meet the issues of his life. Art and music and related topics fall within the sphere of our activities. But while Rosenzweig depends on discussion, Reconstructionism also calls for creative activities in these fields. The Jewish people in all its groups, the civilization of Judaism in all its phases are to be recognized as units both according to Reconstructionism and Rosenzweig. In principle, Rosenzweig

advanced the idea of an *"universitas"* of Judaism, although he actually organized only a *Volk's* university. Had it continued to exist, it would have called for a university of Judaism to supply its need for leaders, instructors and books, as well as for research. Rosenzweig envisions a department of Judaism in some German university around which such a University of Judaism might be built. The great aim envisioned both in the philosophy of Rosenzweig and in Reconstructionism is the enlightened community. In this general scheme the rabbi should not be forgotten.

The Rabbi

Unfortunately, the rabbi has become the "theological corporation lawyer" of the congregation. He stands alone in his congregation; he has no public, no fellows, with whom he could discuss Jewish problems on an equal footing. His community is concerned mainly with the technical setup of the congregation, with interfaith relationships, and so on. There is nothing wrong with rabbinic training. But since the rabbi is not challenged any longer as he works among the people, is not forced by the people to remain on the alert, he faces the danger of losing his Jewish knowledge, his skill, and perhaps even his Jewish personality. The rabbi of today must once again become a *"morenu,"* which means the leader of equals set above them only by his office. As it is, he has become a preacher. But preaching is not speaking; the discussant is not there. As a consequence the rabbi is at a loss to know where to place his emphasis. He resembles the deaf, for he hears no reply. Since the classic text does not seem to be interesting enough for the public, the rabbi moves into the field of actualities. But the actualities must be those suggested by the immediate need of the moment. When the subject treated is expressly chosen because it lends itself to homiletic treatment, the sermon smacks of yesterday. The preacher acts as if somebody had asked him for advice and guidance, but nobody has. Thus his speech tends to be empty of content. Knowing this, the speaker may begin to put on an act. Instead of speaking *to* the people he speaks *before* them. Instead of being heard and understood, he is seen. This situation can be changed only if the rabbi again finds fellow Jews with whom he can "learn," not merely seekers of advice.

What Rosenzweig actually wishes to say can easily be explained by a few quotations taken from Professor Kaplan's address on "Rabbinic Training for Our Day." Rosenzweig takes it for granted that the rabbi brings to his office the "passionate desire to help his people . . . express its individuality." "The Jewish heritage must . . . function as a commitment and as an impelling drive to transform environment." The rabbi must study, but must not become a "walking sarcophagus of dead ideas of religion." The rabbi must apply his Jewish knowledge to the need of the day; he can do that only as he discusses these needs with others, discusses them Jewishly. He will not achieve his goal as long as he stands alone without discussants. It is interesting to note that Dr. Kaplan does not mention the rabbi's function as a preacher at all. On the other hand, Rosenzweig puts more emphasis on study for study's sake, although basically the same idea is expressed in Dr. Kaplan's article, as he quotes the *baraita* in *Nedarim*: "Study the Torah out of love for God, and the honor you deserve will finally come." Rosenzweig would say: study the Torah out of love for God and the answer to all of life's perplexities will finally come out of it.

Rosenzweig's conception of the rabbi is that he must be a specialist, which the

American rabbi cannot afford to be. For that matter, neither could the German rabbi afford to be one. For the rabbi can only be a specialist if the chain of youth education—leadership training—scholar-teacher—rabbi is kept intact. Then the rabbi could again be the challenged challenger, the builder of the new out of the old. Under these ideal conditions Reconstructionism would assign the same role to the rabbi, namely to be the embodiment of and leader towards the wholeness of Jewish life. Our present day conceptions lack this wholeness. Ancient Jewry had it. The rabbi can regain it and transmit it. This is why he must study again *with* others. The rabbi's redemption lies in the education of these others, so that they may study *with* him and stimulate him. On this principle Reconstructionism agrees with Rosenzweig.

The Jews As a People

Rosenzweig developed his definition of the Jews as a people on purely theoretical lines. Reconstructionism found it easier to reach this conclusion; Zionism is proof of Jewish peoplehood. The fact that in Germany full allegiance to two backgrounds was impossible put Rosenzweig in a dilemma, which Reconstructionism did not have to face in America. For in the United States, nationality groups abound, each attached to its kin in the old country, while being at the same time loyal to America. The German Jew had thus two souls. However, quoting the example of the German Jew, Rosenzweig showed that Jews remained primarily Jews. Surrounding themselves with liberals, they moved in a circle which was strictly circumscribed. They deceived themselves into imagining that only those who associated with them were "true" to the spirit of the country. If German Jews were Germans, he said, they would blush at the defection even of the meanest of Germans, taking responsibility for every German. This is not the case. Jews take pride in the achievement of any Jew in any country and blush at the wrong committed by any Jew in any country. This means only one thing: the Jews are a people.

Rosenzweig thus stated categorically that the true sword of the Jew in the battle of life was his national consciousness, his Jewish spirit and Jewish life. To make his point absolutely clear, he came out—long before Hitler—with the statement that the Jews have to become "race conscious." *Race,* of course, was not used in the Hitlerian sense but in the sense of Herzl's *one people.* The remedies against attacks from the outside are a Jewish athomeness and the fight for equality with other peoples not merely for equality as individuals, but for equality as a people. Only if the Jewish group as a whole has equal rights can the individual Jew feel free. In the midst of attacks directed against Jewry, Rosenzweig had this to say:

> "To be a Jew means to be in *galut.* Jewish life is the form through which we can make the fact of our being Jews bearable. The wall stands without our fault or participation. Whether we, within the wall, wish to dwell on barren ground or in a beautiful garden, that, to a certain degree, depends on ourselves."

Rosenzweig, like Reconstructionism, thus rejects assimilationism on practical grounds: it will not work. The Jew will not win Gentile acceptance. Like Reconstructionism, Rosenzweig rejects assimilationism on ethical grounds: in order to become assimilated the Jew would have to break completely with his people. He would have to delve into the recesses of his emotions, to tear out whatever binds him to his people and replace it with a sense of responsibility for those alien to

him. In short, he would completely lose his self-respect. Rosenzweig could not square one allegiance with the other and so he saw in the Jew a permanently split personality. Reconstructionism has squared the two by making it clear that though there is only one political allegiance for American Jews, namely to America, the American principle of democracy permits the fostering of Jewish cultural values along with those of America. Thus where Rosenzweig saw eternal barriers, Reconstructionism sees only temporary ones, even though the "temporary" condition may extend over ages.

Zionism

On the basis of these ideas, Rosenzweig should have been a Zionist. He once said that he would be a Zionist if his conscience would only permit it. As a matter of fact he would embrace Zionism were he alive today. Rosenzweig saw clearly that it had a greater spiritual power than Liberalism. It allowed its followers to be truthful, which was not possible for German Liberal Jews who faced the dilemma of being forced to be either Germans or Jews. Zionism, so Rosenzweig saw, restored health to many.

Rosenzweig, however, thought of Zionism as Herzl envisioned it, but he could not accept it on those terms. Herzl was like Moses to him, envisioning something eternal, a Jewish state, designed to be a model state and embracing all Jews. Herzl spoke with derision of the Jews who refused to go to Palestine. The true Zionist must break his ties with the country in which he lives. So Herzl saw it, but Rosenzweig, though in agreement with Herzl on the need of a Jewish state, felt unable to follow him. He wanted to remain in Germany for a special reason. He felt that "the spirit of the spiritual center (in Eretz Yisrael) cannot develop in the sense of unfettered nationalism, even if it should want to. For the sake of its very character as a center it has at all times to consider the periphery whose law of life can never be pure nationalism but must be a nationalism that functions as an element of religion, by reason of the sociological conditions inherent in a minority." Rosenzweig thought that Palestine and Palestinian Jewry must be the center. They would guide; they would be normal. But normalcy is contrary to the idea of the Jewish people. If unchecked, Palestinian Jewry would become a nation like other nations; would be *assimilated nationally*. The spirit would vanish. Therefore this development must be checked by Jewry in the Diaspora where Jews will continue to live abnormal lives. Diaspora Jewry and Palestinian Jewry are both necessary; Palestinian Jewry to give new strength to the Diaspora, and the Diaspora to prevent Palestinian Jewry from ever forgetting the unique God-ordained place of Israel in the world. Rosenzweig saw his own place as being in the Diaspora, and therefore could not be a Zionist on Herzl's terms, although he could have been a Zionist as allegiance to Zionism is conceived in our day.

Rosenzweig admits that Zionism proved itself an excellent diagnostician of our Jewish ills. We have become a people without originality. Only the soil of the homeland can heal the soul of the people. Zionism has rendered valuable service to the Synagogue, a service comparable to that rendered by socialism to the churches, socialism having done more for the realization of the kingdom of God (the Church's program) than all the churchgoers taken together. Zionism and the Synagogue therefore must recognize each other as co-workers of equal status, neither of whom can complete its task without the other's maximum help.

A nationalism based on the premise that mere existence as a nation is enough

would be dangerous. It would put the national idea in the place of religion. But our distinction as Jews has been the spiritual quality of Jewish life. Rosenzweig felt that this spiritual quality would disappear if all Jews lived in Eretz Yisrael and led a life like that of the other nations. After perhaps two hundred years we would be Jews no more. We would cease to be self-conscious, and self-consciousness is a pre-requisite of our life. For we were not born like other peoples; we were taken as "a people out of the midst of another people" and thus forced to think of our particular status from our very origin. Zionism must therefore continue the chain of Jewish tradition. Jews would suffocate in an atmosphere without Jewish tradition. That they have not done so already is due to the fact that they have still enough oxygen from their fathers to sustain life. The next generation may not have that any more.

It is interesting to note that these predictions seem to have come true, at least in the opinion of one observer. Koestler's description of the young generation in Palestine, if correct, bears out what Rosenzweig predicted.

Rosenzweig remained in Germany, not because it was easier to remain, but because he felt that he should demonstrate to his people in the Diaspora, that no Jew was homeless who possessed the Torah, his "portable fatherland," that no Jew need feel that his was only a "portable homelessness." Rosenzweig remained in Germany because he felt that a strong Diaspora could be of great help to the renascence of the Jewish spirit on Jewish soil. "For the Jew of today," he says, "the danger consists in the possibility of his casting roots in the periphery. The Zionist idea works against that. For the Jew of tomorrow, the danger will consist in his possibly casting roots in the future center. This, by its visible newness, could deprive him of his renewal, deprive Judaism of the very fruits of Zionism. Where a people feels its danger there it gathers its strength."

It may have been providential that Rosenzweig gave this guiding idea to the people of his generation. From it the *olim* (immigrants to Eretz Yisrael) as well as the DP's derived strength in the knowledge that they were neither homeless nor useless. "In the next few decades," Rosenzweig said, almost prophetically, "it will be the *galut* which will have to prove the inner strength of Judaism, regardless of what may be its outward destiny." That our strength today has to rally around Zion, Rosenzweig would have been the first to acknowledge.

Rosenzweig saw clearly that, to use a quotation from the Reconstructionist pamphlet on Zionism, "the Jewish world will have two poles: the homeland and the Diaspora." The viewpoint of Reconstructionism is thus identical with that of Rosenzweig. It is unfortunate that Rosenzweig did not see that he could be a Zionist on this basis. Eretz Yisrael is recognized by Reconstructionism as the center which should guide us. The Yishuv can sustain us, and we must sustain the Yishuv. That we have failed on that point, except financially, has been criticized by Reconstructionism. Eretz Yisrael and the Diaspora both will exist, and both will have to contribute to the full toward the enhancement of Jewish life everywhere.

Conclusion

We have tried to compare Franz Rosenzweig's practical ideas with those of Reconstructionism. Rosenzweig's ideas were given a more detailed treatment for the simple reason that they are not easily available to most of our readers, who

have no difficulty in acquainting themselves with the details of Reconstructionist philosophy and its program.

Rosenzweig and Reconstructionism arrived at their conclusions independently of each other. But they both proceeded by responding to the same factual situation, the present tendency of the Jewish people and of Judaism to disintegrate. The close similarity of their solutions therefore is corroborative evidence of the relevancy of their ideas and program to our time and of their competence as practical guides for the rebuilding of Judaism.

Two Lyrics

By ROSALIND DARROW

PRINCESS MICHAL'S SONG

I

Here in the garden
Sit David and I
Weaving a garland
Of cob-webs and dew
David is telling his
Love in a song
And the music is sweet
And the words are not true.

II

David is born with
The wanderer's curse
That yearns toward the desert
And looks to the skies
—But David has taken
My face in his hands
And presses his lips
Upon each of my eyes.

III

Here in the garden
Sit David and I
Close by the fountain,
With hands woven tight.
Evening will take him
Away to the hills
And I shall weave
Garlands alone in the night.

DAVID TO JONATHAN

Let us go, you and I alone,
To feast our hearts upon the star-lit hills.
The night is very young and fair,
And cool the tangled stream
Wherein the moonlight spills.

Let us be far from these, the hearths of home—
These tents, frail hearts and women love.
Beyond the olive haunts
And far above,
And where the night unfurls the wind,
There, all my troubled heart will I reveal.
And when my mind is cleansed
Of certain fears
Then we will swear our love, oh Jonathan, my brother,
And my soul's own friend!

Random Thoughts

IN any oppressed minority there are always some who share the majority prejudices against their own kind.

* * *

Jews who have no authentic knowledge about their own people are bound to accept as truth that image of their people which is refracted by the hates and prejudices of their neighbors.

* * *

Most people turn up their noses at a religious ceremony which lacks the patina or green rust, of antiquity. Which only shows that to most people patina counts for more than what it covers.

* * *

Identifying the element of unreason in human events is the nearest we can get to having them fall into a meaningful pattern.

* * *

Long before the Nazis made an art of scientific faking to justify their insane racialist theories, our own South had developed that art to justify slavery, and was later joined in it by the North to justify keeping out Jews and Italians.

* * *

A mother who is a volunteer worker in a nursery center where a mixed group of children of different racial and religious backgrounds are brought to play describes the little children as being free from prejudices.

She concludes her account by saying: "The trouble is that children have parents. Parents teach them to hate."

Perhaps, it would be more accurate though less witty, to say: The trouble is that the children have parents, and the parents had grandparents and teachers and schools who had taught them to dislike the unlike.

* * *

"To each one according to his needs," is not original with the Communists.

It is found in the Book of Proverbs, where we read: "Give me neither riches nor poverty—provide me with food sufficient for my needs." (*Prov.* 30:8).

* * *

Man's significance seemed to have been deflated for all time when the astronomers discovered the earth's centrality to be an illusion.

Yet at that very time his significance grew, for just then the philosophers began to discover that all reality, including the farthest reaches of his telescope is, in a sense, the product of his own mind.

Man's moral responsibility seemed to suffer eclipse when the biologists discovered the determining influence of heredity and environment.

Yet at that very time it began to shine anew, for the physicists then began to point the way to the inexhaustible sources of power by means of which he might bring both heredity and environment under control.

* * *

The mind unquestionably needs opiates from time to time to take it off its troubles.

But the question is: Must those opiates, however, always be such poisons as alcohol, gambling, lying movies and superstitious religion?

* * *

If we are inclined to deplore the fact that our country does not look to our academicians for guidance as much as it might, let us recall what happened in

Germany where academicians were taken more seriously than anywhere else in the world.

The truth is that, despite Plato's contention, philosophers are as corruptible as priests, soldiers, lawyers and men of business.

* * *

Lord Acton's famous aphorism that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely is only relatively true.

To say that power corrupts is like saying that desire perverts.

Power and desire are only synonyms for life.

The Buddhists drew from that fact the inference that life, as well as desire and power, is evil and that the only good is nirvana.

If we refuse to draw such inferences, then we must believe that life, desire and power are *subject* to corruption, but not that they corrupt.

* * *

We should study the history of our people—not for the purpose of learning what to boast of, but for the purpose of knowing what we are.

To know what we are is a prerequisite to knowing what we *ought* to be.

* * *

A visionary is a person who assumes that people want what they need.

M. M. K.

Book Notes

EXILE OR DIASPORA, WHICH?

GALUT. By Yitzhak F. Baer. Schocken Books, Inc., N. Y. 1947. 123 pp. $1.50.

IN the long drawn-out defensive struggle for existence, which we Jews have had to wage throughout the centuries, our only weapons have been ideas. Among those ideas the most potent one has been that of *Galut.* It is the idea which reminds Jews that their status is that of a people exiled from its homeland. The small volume entitled *Galut,* by the noted historian F. Baer who teaches at the Hebrew University at Jerusalem, tells the story of that idea. That story contains enough details to hold the interest of the reader, and is told with a warmth that comes from a desire to persuade as well as inform.

On closer inspection, the *galut* idea turns out to be a whole constellation of beliefs. Those beliefs have functioned in the Jewish consciousness ever since the Jews have lived away from Eretz Yisrael. This fact is set forth in a series of brief and telling chapters which summarizes the principal articulations of the *galut* idea. Baer makes clear that every time there was occasion to articulate anew the idea of *galut,* it received deeper meaning and was given a new lease on life. The concluding chapter and epilogue touch upon the attempt during the last two centuries to reinterpret the idea of *galut.* There our author shows how the idea has been diverted from the original goal, and what new and unwarranted implications have been introduced into it that nullify its original intent. The goal originally contemplated in the *galut* idea was Israel's return to their ancestral home. And among its important implications were: (1) that the Jewish people does not belong to the realm of causal or natural history, and (2) that there is no alterna-

ive to life in dispersion other than the eturn of all Israel to Eretz Yisrael.

The main value of the booklet is that corrects the prevalent notion that the eliefs which have contributed to the sur- ival of the Jewish people have been those vhich center around the God idea. If vhat Baer points out is true, the Jews' valuation of their own condition and tatus among other peoples as one of home- essness was far more potent as a means f survival than ethical monotheism. Thus, in the final analysis, other things eing equal, the survival of the Jewish eople, like that of any other minority roup, depends upon the conception it has f its own being and place in the world. All other ideas constitute to a large ex- ent merely the rationale for that con- eption.

The author is unquestionaly on *terra irma* when he points out that, implied n the *traditional galut* idea, was the as- umption that the Jewish people does not elong to the realm of causal history. But Baer does not confine himself to the his- ory of the *galut* idea. He is interested in ts significance for our day, which, ac- ording to him, depends as much as ever pon the *traditional* assumption that the ewish people transcends the law of cause nd effect. In spite, however, of the deep motional conviction with which the au- hor states that principle, he is far from onvincing. It certainly is not the prin- iple which has helped the author achieve is reputation as a Jewish historian. He eplores the secularization of history vhich marks the modern outlook. Yet, ne suspects that this modern approach o history has stood our author in good tead in his scholary endeavors.

As a matter of fact, one finds it diffi- ult to follow the author when he steps ut of the role of historian and takes up hat of the preacher. If he had retained he historical perspective which he displays in the main body of the book, he would not have permitted himself to be swayed by the tragic events of recent years. In a mood brought on by failure of nerve, he falls back helplessly upon a mere reiteration of the dogma which time has rendered obsolete. He should have recalled that with which he rightly credits Judah ha-Levi. "Judah ha-Levi," he says, "is the first thinker after the political decline of the Jewish nation to give theoretical consideration to the problem of the *galut*. And the problem required a new consideration, for the preceding centuries had witnessed an essential alteration in the political picture of the world." Surely much more than an "essential alteration" of the political picture of the world has taken place during the last two centuries. The very ways of human thought have been transformed. The entire structure of human values has been shaken to its foundations. When, if not in our day, has the "*galut* problem" required a new consideration? That new consideration is conspicuously absent in this study of "*galut.*"

When will our historians learn that the purpose in reconstructing the past is not to make it a place of permanent abode? More often such a reconstruction is necessary in order to help us identify the new elements in the *present* situation for which there is no precedent in the past. That is certain to be our main practical interest in the history of the *galut* idea, and that is just wherein Baer fails us most.

MORDECAI M. KAPLAN

BOOKS RECEIVED

CONFLICTS OF POWER IN MODERN CULTURE, a symposium edited by Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, R. M. MacIver. The seventh symposium, held under the auspices of the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, addresses itself to the problem: "How can we retain the essential advantages of our civilization, including its scientific and material assets, and

yet bring the quest for power and the tendency toward aggression under control? Can we reorient men's minds, through influencing their cultural environment from infancy, so that they will find fulfillment in achievement, rather than in the credit and recognition of achievement?" The book contains 62 chapters by as many scholars. Among the subjects treated are, "The Nature of Western Culture with Particular Reference to the Tendency toward Aggressiveness," "The Transmission and Transformation of Culture and the Relation of these Processes to the Problem of Aggressiveness," "Problems of the Integration of Human Culture," "Effects of Religion and Other Social and Cultural Influences upon Power Relations," "Ideas and Ideals as Sources of Power in the Modern World," "The Role of Political Power as Divisive and as Integrating Factor in Western Culture," "Culture and Power in the Modern World." xiii + 703 pp. including index. Distributed by Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1947. $6.50.

LANGUAGE OF FAITH, edited by Nahum N. Glatzer, a selection of some of the most expressive Jewish prayers in Hebrew, Aramaic and Yiddish, with original text and with an English translation by Jacob Sloan and Olga Marx. 128 pp. Schocken Books, New York, 1947. $1.50.

SOLOMON MAIMON, an autobiography, edited by Moses Hadas. The autobiography of one of the most interesting personalities of the period of the Emancipation, with an Epilogue by the editor discussing the significance of Maimon's confessions. 116 pp. Schocken Books, New York, 1947. $1.50.

RABBI OF BACHRACH, by Heinrich Heine, a fragment of a historic novel begun by Heine at the age of 26, of which the later chapters have been lost. Included in the book are a selection from Heine's letters relating to it, and an Epilogue by Erich Loewenthal. 93 pp. Schocken Books, New York, 1947. $1.50.

FROM THE LAND OF SHEBA, tales of the Jews of Yemen, collected and edited by S. D. Goitein, contains interesting folk lore gathered at first hand from Jews who came from this intensely devout Jewish community living isolated in an Islamic world. 122 pp. Schocken Books, New York, 1947. $1.50.

FREEDOM AND EXPERIENCE, essays in honor of Horace M. Kallen, edited by Sidney Hook and Milton R. Konvitz. Contains a foreword by Alvin Johnson, essays by 22 eminent scholars on themes related to Dr. Kallen's main interests, and a bibliography. Divided into four sections dealing with "Cultural Pluralism and Freedom," "Philosophy of Education," "Art and the Artist," "Logic, Naturalism and Religion," xiv + 345 pp. Cornell University Press. Ithaca and New York, 1947. $3.50.

THE PHARISEES AND OTHER ESSAYS, by Leo Baeck. Seven essays on Jewish religious themes by the saintly and scholarly leader of German Jewry during the ordeal of the Nazi domination. vii + 164 pp. Schocken Books, New York, 1947. $3.00.

RÖYTE POMERANTSEN, edited by Immanuel Ilsvanger, a selection of classic Jewish humor, told in Yiddish but printed in the Roman alphabet, with an English introduction, a pronunciation guide, glossary and index. xiv + 205 pp. $3.00.

CORRESPONDENCE

How Appeal for Jewish Education

Sirs:

This being the week of Jewish education permit me to voice my opinion on the subject. I have followed with great interest the work of the Jewish Education Association since its inception. The work of the Jewish Education Association has made very little progress in comparison let us say, with the Zionist Organization. The question arises, why? Is not Jewish education as important as Zionism? Something is wrong. Perhaps it is the approach of the appeal heretofore made for Jewish education.

The appeal for Jewish education has been made on the ground that Jewish education will preserve Judaism. This kind of an approach is, in my opinion wrong. Jews interested in the survival of Judaism need not be appealed to to give their children a Jewish education; they do give their children a Jewish education. What we must do, is to make an effort to reach that type of Jew who is indifferent to Jewish life. For them, we must use an entirely different approach.

To them, the approach must be from the standpoint that a Jewish education for their children is in the interest of the children, as in truth it is.

We can point out to them that a child with a Jewish education is a happy child. For that child knows that the Jewish people had great men who made a contribution to our civilization as did men of other peoples. This makes the child proud of being a Jew, and happy to be one. On the other hand, the Jewish child without a Jewish education, not knowing that his people also had great men, feels inferior to children of other peoples and ashamed of being a Jew. Consequently, he is a very unhappy child. In speaking of children, I naturally mean teen-agers.

DR. ABRAHAM LEBOW